

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Boz 1450 Alexandria, Vignnia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING	DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/661,986	09/14	/2000	Harold Rosen	pd-2000083	8909
20991	7590	08/27/2003		•	
HUGHES ELECTRONICS CORPORATION			EXAMINER		
PATENT DO BLDG 001 N		INISTRATION		LEI, TSU	LEUN R
P O BOX 956 EL SEGUNDO, CA 902450956			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,			2686	-0/
			DATE MAILED: 08/27/2003	$\mathcal O$	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



				_
	•	Appliçation No.	Applicant(s)	
•		09/661,986	ROSEN ET AL.	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		TSULEUN R. LEI	2686	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	
	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY	/ IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH	(S) FROM	
THE I - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failu - Any r	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) da vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fron cause the application to become ABANDONI	mely filed ys will be considered timely. n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 J</u>			
2a)□	,	is action is non-final.		
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowationsed in accordance with the practice under	ince except for formal matters, p Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11,	prosecution as to the ments is 453 O.G. 213.	
•	ion of Claims			
•	Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw			
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.	WITHOUT CONSIDERATION.		
·				
•	Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
•	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement		
=	ion Papers	election requirement.		
	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.		
,—	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)□ accep		aminer.	
,	Applicant may not request that any objection to the			
11)[The proposed drawing correction filed on	_ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disappr	roved by the Examiner.	
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in rep			
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer.		
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120			
13)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a)	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:			
	1. Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received.		
	2. Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received in Applica	tion No	
* (3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bu See the attached detailed Office action for a list	reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		
14) []	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domesti	c priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	(e) (to a provisional application).
á	a) The translation of the foreign language pro Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domest	ovisional application has been re	ceived.	
Attachmen	•	- -		
2) Notic	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>6</u>	5) Notice of Informa	ry (PTO-413) Paper No(s) I Patent Application (PTO-152)	
S. Patent and 1	Frademark Office			

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perahia et al. (U.S. Patent 6,188,896) in view of Han et al. (U.S. Patent 4,343,005).

Regarding Claim 1, Perahia teaches a method of preventing interference in a communication system comprising the steps of generating a fixed reuse pattern in a service area from a high altitude communications device (Fig.6), said pattern having at least a first resource cell and a second resource cell (Fig.6). Perahia does not teach selectively suppressing a side lobe of a beam. However, Han teaches that the sidelobe patterns can be successfully suppressed by careful antenna design as to permit reuse of resources (Han, Col.5, Lines 24-27). Also, it is obvious that the purpose of sidelobe suppression is to allow resource reuse, so the resulting pattern of the suppressed sidelobe would be such that the suppressed portion would align with the reused resource and the non-suppressed portion would be other than the reused resource. Therefore, It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

Application/Control Number: 09/661,986

Art Unit: 2686

Perahia, so the reuse pattern can be shape according to the traffic pattern. Perahia as modified by Han teaches a high altitude communication device selectively suppressing a side lobe of a beam having a first resource to form a suppressed portion and a non-suppressed portion so that said non-suppressed portion aligns with said second resource cell.

Regarding Claim 2, Perahia as modified by Han teaches a method as recited in claim 1 wherein the step of selectively suppressing comprises the step of reshaping the antenna to suppress side lobe interference at the interference locations (Col.5, Lines 21-25; Col.12, Lines 46-48).

Regarding Claim 3, Perahia as modified by Han teaches a method as recited in claim 2.

Neither Perahia nor Han teaches the step of maintaining the shape of the antenna in non-interference location. However, as explained in Claim 1, it is obvious that the purpose of sidelobe suppression is to allow resource reuse, so the resulting pattern of the suppressed sidelobe would be such that the suppressed portion would align with the reused resource and the non-suppressed portion would be other than the reused resource, and therefore, the shape of the antenna in non-interference location would be maintained.

Regarding Claim 4, Perahia as modified by Han teaches a method as recited in claim 1 wherein said first resource and said second resource comprise a frequency (Col.4, Line 44, frequency reuse).

Art Unit: 2686

Regarding Claim 5, Perahia as modified by Han teaches a method as recited in claim 1, but neither Perahia nor Han teaches the first resource and said second resource comprise polarization. However, polarization reuse is commonly used for resource reuse and therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to design a system so the said first resource and said second resource comprise polarization.

Regarding Claim 6, Perahia as modified by Han teaches a method as recited in claim 1, but neither Perahia nor Han teaches the first resource and said second resource comprise an orthogonal code. However, orthogonal code reuse is commonly used in CDMA system for resource reuse and therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to design a system so the said first resource and said second resource comprise an orthogonal code.

Regarding Claim 7, Perahia as modified by Han teaches a method as recited in claim 1 wherein said high altitude communication device comprises a satellite (Fig.6).

Regarding Claim 8, Perahia as modified by Han teaches a communication system as recited in claim 1 wherein said high altitude communication device comprises a stratospheric platform (Perahia, Fig.6, it is inherent that in the satellite-based system of Perahia include the system of stratospheric platform).

Page 5

Application/Control Number: 09/661,986

Art Unit: 2686

Regarding Claim 9, see Claim 1 for the teaching of Perahia and Han.

Regarding Claim 10, see Claim 7 for the teaching of Perahia and Han.

Regarding Claim 11, see Claim 8 for the teaching of Perahia and Han.

Regarding Claim 12, see Claim 4 for the teaching of Perahia and Han.

Regarding Claim 13, see Claim 5 for the teaching of Perahia and Han.

Regarding Claim 14, see Claim 6 for the teaching of Perahia and Han.

Regarding Claim 15, see Claims 1 & 2 for the teaching of Perahia and Han.

Regarding Claim 16, see Claim 3 for the teaching of Perahia and Han.

Regarding Claim 17, see Claim 1 for the teaching of Perahia and Han.

Regarding Claim 18, see Claim 4 for the teaching of Perahia and Han.

Regarding Claim 19, see Claim 5 for the teaching of Perahia and Han.

Page 6

Application/Control Number: 09/661,986

Art Unit: 2686

Regarding Claim 20, see Claim 6 for the teaching of Perahia and Han.

Regarding Claim 21, see Claim 1 for the teaching of Perahia and Han.

Regarding Claim 22, Perahia and Han teach a method as recited in claim 21, further comprising generating the beams using an antenna on-board a high altitude communication device (Perahia, Col.4, Lines 29-32).

Regarding Claim 23, see Claim 7 for the teaching of Perahia and Han.

Regarding Claim 24, see Claim 8 for the teaching of Perahia and Han.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Page 7

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TSULEUN R. LEI whose telephone number is 703-305-4828. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha D Banks-Harold can be reached on 703-305-4379. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

TRL

August 20, 2003

CHARLES APPIAH PRIMARY EXAMINER